IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appln No.:	09/730,144	)	Confirmation No. 8090
Applicant:	Joseph A. Burich	)	
Filed:	December 5, 2000	)	
For:	System, Method and Program Product for Sharing Information	)	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
TC/A.U.:	3621	)	
Examiner:	Jalatee Worjloh	)	

Docket No.: 1410-67111

Customer No.: 22242

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.192, the applicants hereby respectfully submit the following Brief in support of their appeal. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.192(a) this brief is being filed in triplicate.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Kraft Foods Holdings, Inc., a Delaware corporation.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee that will directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

(3)   Status of Claims

Claims 1 through 28 are pending as of this appeal. Claims 1 through 9, 11, 12, 15 through 24, and 26 are the subject of this appeal.

(4)   Status of Amendments

There are no unentered amendments.

(5)   Summary of Invention

This invention relates generally to a computer network for more efficiently sharing member information regarding products among network members. The network members are typically in the same industry, such that the information to be shared over the network is necessary for the manufacture of products such as food products. (Spec. p. 4, line 20 through p. 5, line 11.)

Pursuant to various embodiments, the applicant provides for a computer network where member information is stored and accessible both in a central storage and in a distributed storage arrangement as shown in Figs. 1A and 1B. Certain product information, including specifications, is stored locally at the members' computers or servers 102, 104, 106, and 108 through which the members connect to the network via web server 128. (Spec. p. 5, lines 12 through 21.) A web crawler search engine 122 searches the members' computers and servers 102, 104, 106, and 108 for posted information and indexes the information to make the postings accessible by other members. (Spec. p. 5, lines 16 through 18; p. 8, lines 9 through 21.) Various other product and related information is stored in and accessed from a central storage 126 included in a database server 132. (Spec. p. 5, lines 21 through 22; p.6, lines 10 through 19.) A security policy server 154 maintains user security profiles in a security database 156 to restrict a user's access to only such information as is authorized for a given user. (Spec. p. 6, line 20 through p. 7, line 2.)

Embodiments of the system include other servers and databases to enhance the experience of the users. For instance, a personalization server 116 may be used to personalize each user's experience. (Spec. p. 7, lines 10 through 14.) Also, an ad server 170 may be used to manage, track, and serve advertisements on the pages as a revenue stream for the network. (Spec. p. 7, lines 15 through 20.) Further, web server logs 174 track and log the

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

system activity for each member to assist in generating bills for each member based upon the member's use of the system. (Spec. p. 7, line 21 through p. 8, line 8.)

(6)   The Issues

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mullaney (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037283). Claims 15 through 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Brown (U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,641) and O'Neil (U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,440) in view of Mehring (U.S. Pat. No. 6,609,115). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mullaney in view of Allen (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0051978). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mullaney in view of Rosenberg (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0097235). Claims 8, 9, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mullaney in view of O'Neil. Claims 11, 12, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mullaney.

(7)   Grouping of the Claims

Group 1 – claims 1 through 4.

Group 2 – claims 15 through 22 and 26.

Group 3 – claim 5.

Group 4 – claims 6 and 7.

Group 5 – claims 8, 9, 21, and 22.

Group 6 – claims 11, 12, 23, and 24.

(8)   Arguments

The Law of Anticipation and Obviousness

A claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation is found in a single prior art reference. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997); MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE § 2131 (8th ed., rev. 2, May 2004) ("MPEP"). Anticipation is an issue of fact. *Schreiber*, 128 F.3d at 1477. In the anticipation rejection, The Examiner failed to show that the cited reference teaches or suggests all of the limitations in Applicant's

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

claims. Specifically, the Examiner fails to show that the reference discloses sharing of technical information regarding products.

The Patent and Trademark Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Thrift*, 298 F.3d 1357, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2002); MPEP § 2142. Obviousness is a legal determination based upon underlying factual findings. *Thrift*, 298 F.3d at 1363. The Examiner must meet three basic criteria to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142-2143. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation at the time of the invention to modify or combine the teachings of the cited references to arrive at the claimed invention. *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002); MPEP § 2143.01. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *Noelle v. Lederman*, 355 F.3d 1343, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2004); MPEP § 2143.02. Third, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.03; see *Thrift*, 298 F.3d at 1366.

The Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the various claim groups of this application. The discussions of groups 1 and 2 address issues related to the independent claims which in turn render the dependant claims allowable. The discussions related to groups 3 through 7 address issues raised by the Examiner in relation to separately patentable dependant claims.

Group 1

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The independent claim for this group has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mullaney. Mullaney fails to disclose or suggest sharing of technical information **regarding products**.

Mullaney discloses a computer network to facilitate interaction among members of a marketing community. To do so, Mullaney discloses the use of an intermediary or Web server where members store information about themselves and use the intermediary to send marketing related e-mail communications to their contact lists. Mullaney also discloses that the member information posted on the centralized Web server may be searchable such that members of the community can contact each other regarding using other members' contact lists.

Mullaney makes no provision for the sharing of technical information regarding products among the members of the system. At most Mullaney discloses the ability to search

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

for information regarding *marketing members* who sell products and/or services relating in some way to the searcher's criteria. (*See* Mullaney ¶¶ 0038 and 0053.) In contrast, the invention as claimed in this group requires a system for managing member information *regarding products*. In other words, the claimed system manages information regarding the products themselves instead of information regarding the members. The sharing of information *regarding products* provides one of the advantages over prior systems for using the claimed system, the ability to easily share information about products that members need to know. (*See* Spec. p.1, lines 10 through 17; p. 3, line 22 through p. 4, line 5; and p. 11, line 18 through p. 12, line 3.) Mullaney does not explicitly or inherently disclose a system of managing information *regarding products* for the benefit of industry members. Instead, the Mullaney system is for sharing information regarding members for marketing purposes.

There are other worthy differences as well, but the above should suffice to support the applicant's position that Mullaney does not anticipate the recitations of these claims. Claims 2 through 14 are dependent upon and further limit claim 1. Therefore, these claims should also pass to allowance. As discussed below in separate groups, Claims 5 through 14 are also separately patentable and do not stand or fall with Group 1.

Group 2

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

These claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and O'Neil in view of Mehring. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of O'Neil, Mehring, and Brown to create the claimed system. In particular, the teachings of Brown suggest only the use of a distributed system and therefore teach away from the use of both central storage and storage in remotely connected computers through which members interface to the information management system.

Brown discloses various systems for automatically updating information stored within a network. In particular, Brown discloses a system for automatically updating product information or specifications for manufacturers, distributors, and retailers connected to a network. In this system, when the specifications for a particular product are changed by a manufacturer, this information is automatically updated on the databases for the distributors and retailers. Each distributor and retailer may pick which products and catalogs to make

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

available on a given database or network. Instead of having to manually update each product spec or catalog, Brown provides a mechanism for updating each listing on the network.

O'Neil discloses a network-based architecture to support the exchange of personal information. In general, O'Neil seems concerned with ensuring the participants of such a network that other participants are essentially vouched for in some way and also with providing a mechanism to ensure that personal information regarding a given user will only be shared with other participants in a particular pre-approved fashion. O'Neil provides examples of such personal information in FIG. 28 and its accompanying text. These examples include city, date of birth, email address, ethnicity, eye color, hair, height, home address, home telephone number, place of birth, state, sex, weight, zip code, and the like. O'Neil also provides a mechanism whereby participants in such a network can conduct searches based upon such personal information to identify, for example, persons of possible interest to the searching party. Such personal information only concerns the network member and not other substantive content as might be placed on the network by the member.

Mehring teaches a centralized system documentation facility. When users can sufficiently authenticate themselves to the satisfaction of the network, they can gain access to a centrally stored document or application. Mehring discloses various approaches to assuring that a given user of the system is in fact authorized to gain access to a given application or item of information. Mehring does not disclose retention of such information in other than a central facility and in particular does not suggest storing such information in remotely connected computers through which members interface to his system.

Claim 15, however, provides for storage of product information in **both** a central storage facility and in remotely connected computers through which members interface to the information management system. Claim 15 further provides that a security policy server selects such product information as is available to each member. Neither O'Neil nor Mehring make such a teaching, either alone or in combination with one another. Mehring essentially fairly teaches that considerable dissemination control can be gained, in part, by utilization of a central storage facility. Combining Mehring with O'Neil would therefore lead one skilled in the art to gain such benefits by providing for central storage only.

Because one skilled in the art would gain such benefits as taught by Mehring by providing for central storage only, one skilled in the art would not be led to combine Brown

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

with Mehring and O'Neil. In particular, the Examiner states that Brown does not expressly disclose "a web server interfacing members with selected product information stored in central storage . . ." Brown does not do so because it teaches a distributed storage network connecting manufacturers, distributors, and retailers with end users. The benefit of this architecture, including the automatic updating algorithm disclosed therein, is **lost** with the use of a central storage system where updating can be done at the one storage site. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Brown with Mehring and O'Neil. If the art teaches away in any material aspect, the obviousness rejection is rebutted. *In re Haruna*, 249 F.3d 1327, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 15 may be passed to allowance. Claims 16 through 28 are dependent upon and further limit claim 15. Therefore, these claims should also pass to allowance. As discussed below in separate groups, Claims 23 through 25, 27, and 28 are also separately patentable and do not stand or fall with Group 2.

Group 3

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of Allen. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Mullaney and Allen to create the claimed system. In particular, there is no motivation to combine the references to create a system for managing member information regarding products with a personalization server for providing personalized content to a member.

Mullaney has been characterized above. In particular, Mullaney provides no references to or indications of providing personalized content to any members of the disclosed system. Allen discloses a system and method for collecting information regarding a user to provide personalized content. As part of the system disclosed by Allen, a personalization server collects information related to users of the system. Then, in response to a request by a user, the system uses this collected information to predict what the user may be interested in viewing.

There is simply no suggestion that the teachings of Mullaney and Allen may be combined. Mullaney does not suggest personalization of provided content in any way. Allen does not suggest searching member provided information in response to a request from a member. At most, the only aspect of Mullaney suggested by Allen is the use of a network.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

This suggestion would suffice to combine all network related references. Such a result is absurd and is avoided when adhering to the rule requiring a motivation to combine the references. *See Lee*, 277 F.3d at 1343 (listing cases affirming the need for a specific showing of a motivation to combine). As such there is no motivation to combine.

The Examiner suggests that the motivation to combine lies in the abstract of Allen which discloses that a personalization server can be used to produce personalized web site content for the user based upon the interest of the user. Allen may disclose this use of a personalization server, but this use would not motivate one skilled in the art to combine Allen with the system of Mullaney. Essentially, the Examiner is suggesting that the disclosure of a personalization server in Allen renders its use in any system obvious. This logic is counter to the law that requires a clear motivation to combine references to avoid the use of hindsight. *See e.g. Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1357 ("If identification of each claimed element in the prior art were sufficient to negate patentability, very few patents would issue. . . . Such an approach would be an illogical and inappropriate process by which to determine patentability." (internal quotes and citations omitted)). Thus, there is no motivation to combine suggested by the references.

Group 4

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

These claims, 6 and 7, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of Rosenberg. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Mullaney and Rosenberg to create the claimed system. In particular, there is no motivation to combine the references to create a system for managing member information regarding products with an ad server for providing advertisements to a member.

Mullaney has been characterized above. In particular, Mullaney provides no references to or indications of providing advertisements to any members of the disclosed system. Rosenberg discloses a system and method for dynamic ad placement. In particular, Rosenberg discloses advertisement placement on web pages and in other media outputs such as in recorded television shows. Rosenberg primarily discusses the use of an ad server in connection with video replay devices that are used to replay television signals and the like.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

The system allows dynamic placement of advertisements within the replay of shows "taped" by the video replay device that connects to an ad server.

There is simply no suggestion that the teachings of Mullaney and Rosenberg may be combined. Mullaney does not suggest the use of advertisements or ad servers in any way. Rosenberg notes the use of advertisements and ad servers in connection with web pages, but the patent is directed to the use of an ad server to place advertisements on replayed video. Rosenberg does not describe the use of the patented ad placement system in connection with information networks, much less in the context of a network for sharing member information. As such there is no motivation to combine within the references themselves.

The Examiner suggests that the motivation to combine lies within Rosenberg which discloses a way to quickly deliver ads to receptive audiences. Although Rosenberg does disclose a method of quickly delivering ads to receptive audiences, the method of Rosenberg is not disclosed within the context of a computer network. Thus, one skilled in the art could not be motivated to combine Rosenberg's system of providing advertisements through a video replay system with the computer networking system of Mullaney. *See Haruna*, 249 F.3d at 1335 (If the art teaches away in any material aspect, the obviousness rejection is rebutted.). Essentially, the Examiner is suggesting that the disclosure of an ad server in Rosenberg renders its use in any system obvious. This logic is counter to the law that requires a clear motivation to combine references to avoid the use of hindsight. *See e.g. Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1357 ("If identification of each claimed element in the prior art were sufficient to negate patentability, very few patents would issue. . . . Such an approach would be an illogical and inappropriate process by which to determine patentability." (internal quotes and citations omitted)). Thus, there is no motivation to combine suggested by the references.

Group 5

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

These claims, 8, 9, 21, and 22, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of O'Neil. To the extent the Examiner relies on Mullaney in view of O'Neil to sustain a rejection of claims 21 and 22 as obvious, this appears to be in error. Claims 21 and 22 are dependant from claim 15 which was not rejected under Mullaney. As the rejections stand, however, claims 8, 9, 21, and 22 stand and fall together.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

O'Neil and Mullaney, alone or in combination, do not disclose tracking member use of the system for billing purposes. Also, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Mullaney and O'Neil to create the claimed system. In particular, there is no motivation to combine the references to create a system for managing member information regarding products with billing means for tracking member use and deriving member bills from member use.

Mullaney has been characterized above. In particular, Mullaney provides no references to billing of any kind. O'Neil also has been characterized above. O'Neil briefly describes the use of a commercially available application that handles payment card transactions in connection with the disclosed E-community. In particular, O'Neil describes the use of LivePayment Server 61 for handling transactions by an E-Broker that involve the transfer of money. (*See* O'Neil 21:37-62.) The **only** such transactions disclosed involve a flat fee paid for a **particular transaction** such as a charge per unit information released. (*Id.*) In contrast, the billing system of the Applicant charges according to the member's use of the system in general. This critical difference renders the Applicant's system patentably different from the suggested combination of O'Neil and Mullaney.

In addition to lacking all the claimed elements, there is simply no suggestion that the teachings of Mullaney and O'Neil may be combined. Mullaney does not suggest in any way the use of a billing means or generation of bills based on tracked member use. Further, the O'Neil disclosure does not suggest the use of a billing means where member usage of the system is tracked to generate bills. O'Neil only suggests using a billing program to handle monetary transactions when such specific transactions are made. This does not suggest a combination of the billing system of O'Neil with the marketing system of Mullaney.

The Examiner suggests that the motivation to combine lies in that the billing means provides an effective means for gaining fees to support operation and maintenance expense. This purpose is not suggested in either cited reference. Instead, this purpose is only suggested in the Applicant's disclosure in connection with a discussion of the ad server. (Spec. p. 7, lines 17 through 18.) Hindsight is forbidden in the combination of references. *See e.g. Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1357 ("If identification of each claimed element in the prior art were sufficient to negate patentability, very few patents would issue. . . . Such an approach would be an illogical and inappropriate process by which to determine patentability."

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

(internal quotes and citations omitted)). As such, the Examiner's stated motivation to combine is legally insufficient.

Group 6

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

These claims, 10 through 12 and 23 through 24, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Mullaney. To the extent the Examiner relies on Mullaney in view of O'Neil to sustain a rejection of claims 23 and 24 as obvious, this appears to be in error. Claims 23 and 24 are ultimately dependant from claim 15 which was not rejected under Mullaney. As the rejections stand, however, claims 10 through 12 and 23 through 24 stand and fall together.

Mullaney does not disclose or suggest that the members of the system are members of a common industry such as the food industry or that the members include suppliers, manufacturers, and customers. The Examiner appears to reject these claims based upon an aspect of limitation relevant only to method claims. The claims of this group, however, are apparatus claims. Thus, the limitations of these claims do amount to patentable distinctions over Mullaney. More specifically, the Examiner states that the differences claimed in this group are "only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and [are] not functionally involved in the steps recited." The claims of this group are directed to a system and not a method; therefore this statement is inapposite.

Similarly, the cases cited by the Examiner relate to irrelevant printed matter rejections. *See In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582-83, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1033-35 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1386, 217 U.S.P.Q. 401, 403-05 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The claims of this group do not claim functional printed matter on an otherwise unpatentable apparatus. In contrast, the claims of this group present limitations on the scope of the system; therefore, the cases cited by the Examiner are irrelevant. Further, all the words and limitations of the claims must be considered. *See ACCO Brands, Inc. v. Micro Sec. Devices, Inc.*, 346 F.3d 1075, 1078 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing *K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.*, 191 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (explaining that functional language is a limitation on an apparatus claim)). Thus, the limitations of these claims to a particular industry are patentable limitations.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

At best, Mullaney discloses a system for marketing community members to search each other to share contacts lists. Such a disclosure does not suggest a system for a common industry such as the food industry or where members of the system are suppliers, manufacturers, and customers of the industry. Thus, the limitations of these claims to a system with members from the food industry where the members are suppliers, manufacturers, and customers of the food industry, limitations admitted by the Examiner to be absent from Mullaney, constitute patentable distinctions over Mullaney.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the claims of this group be passed to allowance.

(9)   The Claims

1.   (Previously amended) A member accessible information system for managing member information regarding products, and selectively providing the member information to individual members, said system comprising:

a plurality of remotely connected computers connected together over a network, members accessing member information regarding products over ones of said remotely connected computers, and wherein at least some member information regarding at least one product resides within at least one of the remotely connected computers;

means for maintaining said member information regarding products;

means for searching through member information regarding products responsive to an information request from a member; and

means for selectively allowing members to request said member information regarding products.

2.   (Previously amended) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein the means for selectively allowing members to request member information regarding products comprises:

login means for receiving a member identification and corresponding password and, providing a logging-in member portions of said member information responsive to a request.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

3.   (Previously amended) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein the means for maintaining member information regarding products comprises:

a webserver storing static content information and serving said static content to members;

an appserver storing applications for use by members and selectively executing stored applications responsive to selected requests from members;

a database server storing said member information regarding products and also storing procedures and functions, said database server managing said stored member information, procedures and functions and providing selected portions of said member information regarding products responsive to appropriate requests from authorized members; and

a policy server storing user security profiles and managing said stored user security profiles, each of said members' security profile indicating a level of authorization of a corresponding member.

4.   (Previously amended) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein the means for searching member information regarding products comprises:

a search engine having full text indexing and searching capability for searching member supplied documents regarding products stored in said system; and

a crawler continuously searching and indexing searched said member supplied documents regarding products,

said search engine searching and retrieving documents regarding products indexed by said crawler responsive to member requests.

5.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein said system further comprises a personalization server, said personalization server recording characteristics of content viewed by members and personalizing content, personalized content automatically being made available to corresponding members thereafter.

6.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, said system further comprising an ad server providing advertising content to members.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

7.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 6, wherein said ad server manages ad content scheduling, serving and tracking.

8.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 1 further comprising:
          billing means for tracking member use, deriving member bills from member use and billing individual ones of said members.

9.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 8, said billing means collecting revenues from billed members.

10.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein members of said system are members of a common industry.

11.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 10, wherein members of said common industry include suppliers, manufacturers and customers.

12.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 11, wherein said common industry is the food industry.

13.   (Previously amended) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein member information regarding products is stored on member computers, member computers being ones of said remotely connected computers.

14.   (Previously amended) A member accessible information system as in claim 1, wherein at least a portion of said member information regarding products is located on a central computer with a database server.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

15.   (Previously amended) An information management system for managing product information distribution, said system comprising:

a central storage storing product information for products related to a common industry;

a web server interfacing members with selected product information stored in said central storage and as stored in remotely connected computers through which members interface to the information management system;

a security policy server, selecting product information available to each member; and

a specification storage storing specifications for ones of said products, stored said specifications being selectively provided to ones of said interfacing members.

16.   (Original) An information system as in claim 15, further comprising:

an app server storing applications for use by members and selectively executing stored applications responsive to selected member requests from said web server; and

a policy server storing user security profiles and managing said stored user security profiles, each of said members' security profile indicating a level of authorization of a corresponding member.

17.   (Original) An information system as in claim 16, wherein said central storage is on a database server, said database server storing and managing member information, procedures and functions, and providing selected stored information responsive to appropriate requests from authorized members.

18.   (Original) An information system as in claim 17 further comprising a personalization server recording characteristics of content viewed by members and personalizing content, personalized content automatically being made available to corresponding members thereafter.

19.   (Original) An information system as in claim 18 further comprising an ad server providing advertising content to members.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

20.   (Original) An information system as in claim 19, said ad server scheduling, serving and tracking ad content.

21.   (Original) An information system as in claim 1 further comprising a billing unit tracking member use, deriving member bills from member use and billing individual ones of said members.

22.   (Original) An information system as in claim 21, said billing unit collects revenues from billed members.

23.   (Original) An information system as in claim 21, wherein members of said system are members of the food industry.

24.   (Original) An information system as in claim 23, wherein said food industry members include suppliers, manufacturers and customers.

25.   (Original) A member accessible information system as in claim 21, wherein one or more specifications are stored on member computers, member computers being remotely connected to said information system, the location of remotely stored said specifications being stored on said information system.

26.   (Original) An information system as in claim 25 further comprising:
        a search engine having full text indexing and searching capability for searching member supplied documents stored in said central storage; and
        a crawler continuously searching and indexing searched said member supplied documents,
        said search engine searching and retrieving documents indexed by said crawler responsive to member requests.

27.   (Original) An information system as in claim 25, wherein one or more specifications are stored in said central storage.

Application No. 09/730,144
Notice of Appeal dated July 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2004

28.   (Original) An information system as in claim 21, wherein one or more specifications are stored in said central storage.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
                    Steven G. Parmelee
                    Registration No. 28,790

Date: July 13, 2004

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Suite 1600
120 South LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: (312) 577-7000
Facsimile: (312) 577-7007